Today's Topics:
               Modifiying radios for out of band operation
                     rec.ham-radio is out of control
                          Where does it go?
                            X.25 & AX.25

In article <798@rsiatl.UUCP>, jgd@rsiatl.UUCP (John G. De Armond) writes:
>
> [and incredible amount of BS deleted]
>
>
 [deleted some quotes]

> Well, rich, It's a bit hard to keep emotion in check when one reads such
> a collection of bovine effluvia but I'll try. Rarely have I seen such
> ignorance of the law and common sense coupled together with acute
> chicken little syndrome.
>
> Your post and logic shows an ignorance of:
>
> 1)   The law as regards Amateur Service.
> 2) The law as regards Public Service/Commercial service.
> 3) Reality.
> 4) Common sense.
>
     [deleted mis-conception that I said the act of modifying a radio
was against the law]

     I don't think I said that the modification itself was illegal, only
the use ON-THE-AIR in the NON-TYPE-ACCEPTED service was illegal.

> Next, commercial and Public service.   The law specifically permits the
> use of ANY communications mode to mitigate a life-threatening situation.
> I'll let you find the paragraph; it's been posted here before. Maybe
> while you're looking, you'll read some of the other interesting paragraphs.
> That means I can use any radio on any frequency if sufficient danger
> exists. What is sufficient danger? I think each ham has to determine that
> himself and be prepared to defend his actions. Certainly dialing over

```
> to the local police dispatch frequency to report a car wreck is
> inappropriate and could not be defended.  On the other hand, if I come
> up on a car wreck and find a victim bleeding or perhaps with a broken
> neck, and I cannot find a ham repeater with patch, you bet yer ass I'm
> going to get on the police frequency call out a unit.  Anyone who would
> not should be prosecuted for negligence in my book.  I'll gladly
> take any heat forthcomming after the fact.  I'd bet the bank on there
> not being any.
>
     no argument for *real* emergencies, although I believe that if
you attemped to contact a 'dispatcher' directly on the air, that the
first reaction would be one of a 'hoax', although they would probably
check out the situation first.

 [more deleted stuff]
>
> Next, Reality.  The reality is that modern amateur HTs meet or exceed
> commercial specifications.  The reason is simple.  With few exceptions,
> the amateur and commercial radios are the same with only firmware
> changes.  So if a ham accidently (or on purpose) transmits on a commercial
> frequency, the sun won't quit shining and the gods of EMI will not smite
> the radio from his hand.  He will be breaking an anachronistic law
> regarding type acceptance.
>
> Speaking of type acceptance, I marvel at the hams that speak in
> ignorant awe of "Type Acceptance" as if it were some rite of passage
> a vendor must put a radio through.  All this is, boys and girls, is
> the process of submitting a radio to some standardized tests the results
> of which indicate that there is a high probability that production units
> will also meet.  This is an anachronism that should go the same way as
> the 1st class commercial.  Back in the days when analog FM* really did
> go on under the covers and when it was state-of-the-art to make a
> crystal capable of 0.025% stability over the temperature range, it made
> sense to require extensive type acceptance testing AND to certify
> those wizards who were permitted to lift the covers on the FM*.
>
> Now that FM* is contained within LSI chips and crystals capable of 0.001%
> stability are commodities, licensing the wizards makes no sense and
> neither does type acceptance.  Half of the problem is already resolved.
>
> So if I were to transmit on a commercial frequency, I know that
> my radio is at least as good as the one on the other end.  I don't do this
> because I try to live within the rules but it's no felony if I do.
>
     Still, this is AGAINST the LAW.... As I said in my posting, MOST
hams think because a radio is able to meet (or exceed) the specs of a type
accepted radio, then it is OK to use in commercial service,  WRONG!!
```

If it was ok to do this these days, then manufacturers would skip the
type acceptance procedure, and would be able to bring radios to market for
less money. And they would just love to do this, because if the cost comes
down, then more people would buy them, hence more profit.

     We need to show that we (Amateurs) are reponsible, and will abide
by the laws... If we think that the laws are improper, then lets get them
changed, not disobey them because we think that they are improper.

> Lastly, is common sense. This posting really addresses common sense,
> a commodity sadly lacking in today's hams. And this is typically
> coupled with an almost mantical desire to tend to others' business.
>
> Perhaps you should consider some other uses for radios modified for
> out of band service. These include
>
> 1. driving transverters.
> 2. Generating test signals.
> 3. Listening to test signals from other radios.
> 4. Monitoring public service frequencies as a public oversight function.

     I agree with all of these, they do not include transmitting in
a non-amateur service (for the sake of arguments, I will assume transmitting
means RADIATING a signal).

>
> Lastly, assume for the moment that what I've said is not true and that
> transmitting out of band is truely evil. If, as you said, the possibility
> of an evil modified radio falling into bad hands is such a problem, why
> has this problem not become significant? Or even a problem? Maybe
> it's not such a problem after all.
>
> John
>

     Evil, NO, illegal YES... If we are not resposible, then we will pay
the price...

     I had hoped for a discussion on how we could continue to be accountable
for our actions, stating emotional items is not being responsible (i.e: If my
radio meets or exceeds the specs of a type-accepted unit, then it is OK to
use in the commercial service).

     I hate legalese (there are too many disclaimers in this world), and
people SHOULD be held responsible for their OWN actions... How can we handle
this???

I agree that a reason for modifying a radio for TRANSMIT coverage for
use as a signal generator, or input to a transverter (etc) is OK. Yes there
is no law against modifying a radio, but there is rules against transmitting
on a service without a type accepted radio.

    But, MOST hams these days don't do it for these purposes... I was
asked what I base this statement on. I have in the past couple of years made
it a point to ask each person who I have heard on the air (or off the air)
why he/her wants to modify their radio for out of band transmit. Not one
of them said "for use as a signal generator, or to drive a transverter".
I received the following type of answers:

    1) I don't know why, I like to have all the options on my radio.

    2) So I can transmit on police/fire frequencies "just in case".

    3) So I can transmit on commercial frequencies, because Amateur gear
        is less expensive than commercial gear.

    4) Because it increases the value of my radio when I go and sell it.

    If you think I am kidding, try asking people yourself. Or spend 20
minutes standing infront of one of the guys that "sells" modifications at
the ham-fests... and ask why people are paying this guy to modify the radio.

    Many hams gave Radio Shack a VERY HARD TIME about selling a radio
(that was type accepted) that could transmit on the ham bands (10 meters).
Why??? Because we thought that people were not informed that a license was
required. Some felt better when the shack started including a note that
an amateur license was required to operate the radio in the ham bands.

    Should we require a notice with each intruction on how to modify
a radio for out of band transmit:

    Note: It is illegal to transmit with this radio outside of the
            Amateur Radio service.   When modified, this radio HAS NOT
          PASSED TYPE ACCEPTANCE for the commercial or public service bands.
          Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should this radio be used in any
          service when transmitting EVEN if you possess an operators
          license for the service in question.

    I hate this type of thing, (and am not a lawyer type, so the wording
could probably be made more understandable).

    Any ideas????

                Rich

```
--
 /*********************************************************************\
 * Rich Bono (NM1D)    If I could only 'C' forever!!    rbono@necis.nec.com *
 * (508) 635-6300          NEC Technologies Inc.            NM1D@WB1DSW *
 \*********************************************************************/
```

Date: 11 Dec 89 04:19:05 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sunybcs!uhura.cc.rochester.edu!rochester!rit!ultb!
cep4478@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (C.E. Piggott)
Subject: rec.ham-radio is out of control
Message-ID: <1728@ultb.isc.rit.edu>

In article <10506@attctc.Dallas.TX.US> sampson@attctc.Dallas.TX.US (Steve Sampson)
writes:

> ... only garbage. They want a forum, but damn it, if they don't
>talk about what I want, you people are wasting the "bandwidth" and have only
>non-issues to talk about.

Don't be absurd - you missed the point entirely. How about this: most
newsgroups, about once a month or so, post a sort of "charter" - the
best one I have read is for comp.lang.forth - that states a little
bit about the topic (for beginners), answers questions that would
otherwise pop up bi-monthly and linger on and on (airports and HT's,
etc)., and, most importantly, states WHAT TYPES OF MATERIAL ARE AND
ARE NOT APPROPRIATE to the newsgroup. We have no such thing here.

>Why not do us all a favor and unsubscribe? I'd
>rather see heated political discussions than listen to your shit.

Ha. Nice try. Well, let me finish with this: rec.ham-radio is a
very popular newsgroup, and it has reached far outside traditional
'usenet', including crosslinks into local BBS's outside of Usenet
and even to ham radio itself.

Might not hurt to come up with some "intro to ham radio" to be posted
say, monthly; the rest of us can press "n" if we wish, and we can
teach newcomers what belongs here vs. sci.electronics, rec.radio.swl,
and rec.emotional-outbursts.

>Steve Sampson, N5OWK, S.O.B., etc...

Christopher E. Piggott, N2JGW and reasonable guy.

--
cep4478@ultb.isc.rit.edu   Please include a mail path

```
cep4478@RITVAXA.BITNET                      with any E-mail response.  Our
..!rutgers!rochester!ritcv!ultb!cep4478        headers don't reverse too well.


------------------------------

Date: 11 Dec 89 17:29:20
From: David Waters <David_Waters.M1@smtp.ESL.COM>
Subject: Where does it go?
Message-ID: <8912120258.AA10763@esl.ESL.COM>

Where does it go?
Someone writes:
>AT LEAST get the *&^%*&%* SWL and monitoring stuff out of here!  I
>mentioned this before.  There now is a rec.radio.shortwave and yet

I just get Info-Hams Digest mailed to me because I don't have direct access to
things like rec.radio.shortwave. What is it anyway? Where is it anyway? Who
cares? I do!

I vote to keep the content just what it is now, SWL, Scanning and Flames. When
did I get a vote anyway? :-)   After all, those all are a part of my hamming.

If anyone cares to enlighten me (via E-mail or otherwise) on how this net
functions, I'd be glad to learn how to not encourage pollution of Hamming with
other radio stuff.

 Dave Waters          WA6AWZ
 Internet:
 Compuserve:
 GEnie:
 Packet:     David_Waters.M1@SMTP.ESL.COM
             73277,311
             DRWATERS
             What's that?


------------------------------

Date: 11 Dec 89 22:53:21 GMT
From: dtseng!rps@decvax.dec.com  (Robert P. Scott)
Subject: X.25 & AX.25
Message-ID: <7194@dtseng.UUCP>

In article <8912080824.AA01335@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>, MROWEN@STLAWU.BITNET (Mike
Owen W9IP) writes:
> Anybody out there in net-land know where I can acquire
> the full X.25 and AX.25 packet protocols?
```

```
CCITT - Red Book(s) are available from:
     OMNICOM, Inc.
     501 Church St. NE
     Suite 304
     Vienna, VA 22180
     (703)281-1135

Two things though,
     1.  They aren't cheap.
     2.  They are dry reading.



--
D T S  Engineering     |  Robert P. Scott
P. O. Box 277          |  ...!decvax!dtseng!rps -- ...!harvard!zinn!dtseng!rps
Hudson, NH  03051-0277 |
(603)886-1382          |

------------------------------

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1007
***************************************
```